





## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of:

JAMES MARSHALL OATHOUT

**APPLICATION NO.: 09/467,168** 

FILED: DECEMBER 20, 1999

FOR: NONWOVEN FABRICS FOR WIPING

**APPLICATIONS** 

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the non-final Office Action dated September 11,

CASE NO: SS2945USN

**GROUP ART UNIT: 1771** 

**EXAMINER: JENNA LEIGH BEFUMO** 

2002.

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-7, 16 and 17 of the subject application are respectfully requested.

## Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-7 are rejected for the same reasons as set for the in the Office Action, dated February 26, 2002. Likewise, claims 16 and 17 are similarly rejected. The rejection is under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Applicant's admission (Admission) or United Kingdom Publication GB 2 309 466A to Johnson et al. (Johnson) in view of U.S. Patent 4,888,229 to Paley et al (Paley).

The Examiner has essentially repeated the position taken in the previous office action, i.e., that only limitations which affect the method in a manipulative sense that do not amount to claiming of a use of a particular structure are given patentable weight. Ex parte Pfeiffer is again cited as support for this position.

## Reponse to Arguments

In this section, the Examiner asserts that Applicant has failed to demonstrate that using a wiping fabric is new or nonobvious. By way of support for this assertion, the Examiner argues that both the nonwoven fabric and the method of